

97-84042-22

Hill, David Jayne

Address of
David Jayne Hill...

New York

[c1920]

97-84042-22

MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308
Z
Box 112

Hill, David Jayne, 1850-

Address of David Jayne Hill, as temporary
chairman of the Republican state convention,
Saratoga, N. Y., July 27, 1920. New York, Doran
c1920.

cover-title, 25 p. 19 cm.

0114 53

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35 mm

REDUCTION RATIO: 9:1

IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 3-6-97

INITIALS: RB

TRACKING #: 22439

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

~~Gift of the President~~

207
**ADDRESS OF
DAVID JAYNE HILL**

AS TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF THE
REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

SARATOGA, N. Y.

JULY 27, 1920

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

308

Z

Box 112

COPYRIGHT, 1920,
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

M. W. L. July 12, 28.
Fellow Republicans:

We meet as a great historical political party at a time when the American people are soon to make the most far-reaching decision since the founding of our Government. After proving its ability to insure our peace and happiness, it is now assaulted at its very foundations. On the one hand, we are invited to involve this Nation in all the quarrels of Europe and Asia; on the other, we are threatened with revolutionary conspiracies at home.

The supreme issue of the hour is, therefore, clear. It is to preserve the life of the Nation, now doubly endangered. All that has made America great is now at stake, and it devolves upon the Republican Party, and those who in this great emergency will adhere to it, to save Americanism, as a faith and as an achievement, from dissolution and disaster.

It is unnecessary at this time to recount the achievements of the Republican Party, or to revive the memory of the great men who have conceived and executed its policies. They spring spontaneously to the recollection of every intelligent American, for the roll-call of its great champions would include the names most illustrious and most venerated during the whole period of the Party's existence.

What we must not forget is that their work, great as it was, is still an unfinished work, and that it is our

task to complete it. Whatever is necessary to bring it to perfection, that must be done. But we cannot permit to be broken that continuity of our national existence of which the past, the present, and the future are all essential parts. We need, especially at this hour, to remember the fearless spirit and consecration to duty of our great dead. May the serene faith and fidelity of President Lincoln; the deep human sympathy of President McKinley; the courage and passion for righteousness of President Roosevelt, be with us in our thoughts and our deliberations today.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY A NATIONAL PARTY

In no spirit of boastfulness, therefore, but upborne and inspired by the memories of the Party's past service to the Nation, we face the new duties that confront us in this critical hour. I speak of service to the Nation, because more than any other, the Republican Party, from its inception, has been characteristically and distinctively a national party. It was called into being by an issue between the States that challenged the very life of the Nation. Framed by the will of the people, the perpetual compact that had created it, Abraham Lincoln declared, should never be broken; and yet, as he foresaw, a nation half free and half slave could not continue to exist.

In that anxious hour of decision, multitudes of men hesitated, wavered, and finally closed their eyes to an almost self-evident truth; but today, the vanquished equally with the victors, in the hard struggle to preserve the Union and the integrity of the national life, rejoice in the decision that sealed, as we believe, the unity of

the American people in one common nationality for all coming time.

In every great crisis, in every divergence of policy, in every historic decision, the Republican Party has been the national party, the party that has striven to comprehend and to serve the country as a whole.

When the Union was made safe, the energies of the Republican Party were bent to the task of binding it firmly together, in order that all its parts might realize their coherence and enjoy the advantages of their united strength. Through its promotion, the East and the West were bound together with bands of steel, stretching across the continent from ocean to ocean, traversing vast plains and scaling the mountain barriers, making the political aspiration for unity an economic and a material fact. To render this possible, and to develop as a whole the unutilized resources of mine, and forest, and sheepfold, and workshop, the Party applied its policy of protection to American industries, against an opposition purblind to the condition of colonial dependence upon Europe to which that opposition, if successful, would have condemned this vast and resourceful country.

Without that protection of our undeveloped industries, instead of being able to enter the Great War as a potent and decisive force, with munitions, and ships, and all the appliances of a mechanical age, we should not only have been a negligible quantity, but our own land would have been the prize of the invader and the chief victim in the dispositions of peace.

It is disturbing to consider what might have been our fate as a people, if, in 1896, the Republican Party had not taken its stand against the adoption of a fictitious and fraudulent dollar. And yet, as some of us

remember, so plausible were the sophistries employed by the advocates of a millennium to be created by the free coinage of silver at a fixed ratio,—that it took months of popular education in the elements of finance to save the country from overwhelming disaster.

THE TRUE BASIS OF PROGRESS

The recent degeneration of our institutional life could never have occurred, had it not been for our own divisions as a Party. Therefore, let us hope, and resolve, that, in this supreme matter, we shall have no divisions now; for the whole meaning and purpose of a political party are, that, amidst the inevitable and even salutary divergences of private opinion on secondary matters, there shall be perfect unity in that which is immediately vital to the national interest as a whole.

Therefore, let us all unite for "America first"; the Constitution first; the peace and safety of the Nation first; with all forward-looking policies, both domestic and foreign, to follow, as the occasion demands them; but let them all be based on this firm foundation of solid, continuous, and united national development.

DEMOCRATIC BEFOGGING OF THE REAL ISSUE.

To allure men and women from this standard of patriotism, the Democratic Party, in defense of its legacy of Wilsonism, which it has accepted, and could not reject without repudiating the Party's record and the desertion of its whole official class, with its vastly increased cohorts of subordinate place-holders, is befog-

ging the real issue: first, by denouncing the Republican Party in general terms and discrediting its part in a war of defense which its leaders were the first to foresee, the first to prepare for, and foremost in supporting as volunteers, the burdens of which they bore and have still to bear; second, by proposing new public projects to give the Democratic bureaucracy further employment, by which the State of New York, as the most populous State in the Union, would be condemned to a disproportionate amount of taxation, at a time when the government should practice the strictest economy, in order to meet our already heavy obligations and bring to par value in the market the Liberty and Victory Bonds held by the people; and third, the insolent pretense that the Nation's "honor" requires it to assume the political liabilities of all the rest of the world, because President Wilson has, "in his own name and by his own proper authority," promised that we would accept them, if the nations of the world would make him its chief trustee.

The first of these attempts to divert the mind of the people from the real issue, in so far as it relates to the conduct of the war, I leave to the four million men,—officers, and soldiers, and sailors,—who put on their uniforms to defend the rights of our country.

The second attempt I leave to the answer of those who are responsible for the honorable discharge of the national debt, Republicans and Democrats alike, by whose toil and management the burdens of the future must be borne.

But the question of the Nation's "honor,"—that is a matter which concerns us all. That presents a challenge which every patriotic citizen must face.

Let us together then, North and South, East and

West, face the great national duty that now confronts us.

OUR PRESENT NATIONAL DUTY

What is that duty? It is a duty forced upon us by unprecedented political delinquencies and departures from true democracy. It is a duty to protect once more what is vital to the life of this Nation; to repel absorption into a political system designed to subserve the interests of other Powers by the sacrifice of our own; and, finally, to sustain that great compact of constitutional and co-ordinated government which is the very breath of life to this Nation.

We are told, it is already too late; for we have been so far committed by our own proposals and promises that delay and discussion have become dishonorable.

I should not dream of treating this subject,—the most delicate that can be suggested to an American mind,—in the way I am about to treat it, had not the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in his keynote speech at San Francisco, charged the Republican leadership in the United States Senate with conduct of which he asserts, "No blacker crime against civilization has ever soiled the pages of our history"; had not the National Democratic Platform perverted history, denatured documents, and even deliberately altered dates, in the hope of supporting such an accusation; and had it not been declared, in a paragraph referring to the attitude of the Republican Party regarding the Covenant of the League of Nations, negotiated at Paris by the President of the United States: "By every accepted standard of international morality the President is justified in as-

serting that the honor of the country is involved in this business."

It is a curious coincidence that this subject was discussed by Mr. Wilson many years ago, and in a manner that, despite the theatrical gravity with which this accusation is brought, appeals to our sense of humor. "The President," Mr. Wilson wrote, "has really no voice at all in the conclusions of the Senate with reference to his diplomatic transactions. His only power of compelling compliance on the part of the Senate lies in his initiative in negotiation, which affords him a chance to get the country into such scrapes, so pledged in the view of the world, that the Senate hesitates to bring about the appearance of dishonor which would follow its refusal to ratify rash promises."

In all the long debates in the Senate regarding the League of Nations, the question of the national honor was never raised. The question under discussion was the constitutionality and expediency of ratifying what was presented as part, and an essential part, of a treaty; but was, in reality, a new constitution of government esteemed to be in conflict with the powers of government ordained and prescribed by the Constitution of the United States.

I must not, I do not, forget, that in speaking of the President of the United States, I am speaking of the Chief Magistrate of my country. The accusation of "crime" brought against a majority of the Senate of the United States is accentuated by the fact that the Democratic Platform cites the President himself as the author of the statement that "the honor of the country is involved in this business."

THE PRESIDENT'S ASSUMPTION OF
AUTHORITY

It is but just to say that the United States has had no official contact with any foreign country, except through the President himself. If the honor of the country has become in any way involved, it is because of what the President has done or said. At Paris, he was not reticent regarding his plenary powers. On January 25, 1919, speaking before the full Conference, he said of the people of the United States: "They expect their leaders to speak their thoughts and no private purpose of their own. They expect their representatives to be their servants. We have no choice but to obey their mandate; and this—referring to the League of Nations—"is the keystone of the whole fabric. *We would not dare abate a single item of the programme which constitutes our instruction.* We would not dare compromise upon any matter as the champion of this thing."

What were the representatives of European nations to infer regarding the powers of one bearing such a "mandate," and bound by such "instructions"? But where is such a mandate recorded? Where were such instructions ever given? Those instructions, the President said in that same speech, must be obeyed, or this country "would feel that it could not take part in guaranteeing those European settlements"; for that guarantee involved, he said, "the continuous superintendence of the peace of the world by the associated nations of the world"; an association which, in a speech of February 14, 1919, the President described as "the union of wills in a common purpose, a union of *wills which can-*

not be resisted, and which I dare to say *no nation will run the risk of attempting to resist.*"

Who, I ask, ever authorized a promise that the United States would guarantee the European settlements, on condition that there should be formed "*a union of wills that no nation will run the risk of attempting to resist,*" a union, therefore, which the United States itself would not dare to resist—a sovereign corporation, if words have any meaning, supreme over nations, and subject to no rule of action but its own omnipotent will!

Such a mandate and such instructions had never been heard of in the United States. Nothing like them had ever been asked for by the President, either of Congress or of the people. They had given no mandate and issued no instructions. What the President had asked for, and what was unmistakably denied him, was the privilege of making such engagements as he pleased.

THE REJECTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S
APPEAL TO THE ELECTORATE

In his famous appeal to the Electorate, of October 25, 1918, he had said to the people: "If you approve of my leadership and wish me to be your unembarrassed spokesman in affairs at home and abroad, I earnestly beg you will express yourselves unmistakably to that effect by returning a Democratic majority to both the Senate and the House of Representatives."

In November, the country had expressed itself, "unmistakably"; but it offered no mandate to an "unembarrassed spokesman in affairs at home and abroad." "A Republican Congress," he had said, "would divide

the leadership." It was thus made perfectly evident to the President, that, if the wishes of the people were to be respected, "the choice of policy," as he had said, would not rest with him alone.

There was in the country, and the President well understood it, a widespread conviction that he had never at any time rightly comprehended the international situation. His theories were closet theories. Either he had not known, or had not cared, when laws against the violation of neutral territory were disregarded, that they were part of a solemn compact with this country. He had attempted even to silence our consciences on great questions of right and wrong, by imposing a personal neutrality in thought as well as deed. He had for a long time expressed ignorance of what the war was about. At a time when the whole world was in commotion, he had sent abroad diplomatic representatives of our country who either did not know the condition of Europe, or were afraid to inform him, lest he would consider that their minds were no longer going along with his. It is no exaggeration to say, that, after all the vast sacrifices of the war, the mind of the country was disturbed with the thought that the President personally intended to control the negotiations for peace.

I shall not dwell upon this ungrateful theme. But I repel the accusation, that "the honor of the country is involved in this business" in any manner that reflects upon the majority of the Senate of the United States, or upon any who, in a temperate spirit and in the light of knowledge, have resisted the ratification of this treaty, with the obligations which the President has personally endeavored to impose upon the country. If honor has

anywhere been compromised, the American people will judge by whom and wherein.

LIMITATION OF THE PRESIDENT'S POWERS.

While it is clearly within the province of the President of the United States to negotiate treaties, it is not within his constitutional power to promise the ratification of any of their contents; for the reason that the process of treaty making is a joint procedure, in which it is necessary that two-thirds of the Senators shall concur. It is, therefore, a malicious act to censure any Senator for a refusal to give his advice and consent to any treaty, or any part of any treaty, which he may for any reason regard as prejudicial to the interests of his country. On the other hand, since the President is thus restricted by the fundamental law from forcing his own ideas upon the country, it is his plain duty not to exaggerate his powers when dealing with foreign nations, but to remind them that all his work is tentative and incomplete, until his co-partners in the treaty-making process have concurred. Further than this, he should, as far as possible, seek that concurrence before he has committed himself upon a point which may affect his country's honor.

I have hesitated, upon such an occasion as this, to speak of matters so elementary; but the malignant spirit in which the charge that Senators of the United States have trifled with the honor of their country has been made, for merely partisan purposes, has rendered necessary the plain statement, that President Wilson, in a manner without precedent in that high office, not only

claimed in the presence of foreign plenipotentiaries to possess a "mandate" and "instructions" which were only the inventions of his own mind, but proposed without any authority but his own word that the United States would guarantee the European settlements, if the Powers would create a League of Nations that he would approve.

I need not here recite the protest made by the Senate of the United States, when these unauthorized pledges were embodied in a "Constitution of a League of Nations," which the President, by mere force of will, and without analysis or argument, came back from Paris to impose on the American people.

THE REAL CHARACTER OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

There are, or at least there were, some eminent persons who approve, or did approve, if not of the President's methods, at least of the general result of his procedure. They were, on principle, well disposed toward a League of Nations, because they were interested in the cause of peace, and hoped the time had come when the nations would learn war no more.

It would be out of place, on this occasion, after the exhaustive discussion in the Senate and elsewhere, to attempt an elaborate argument regarding the real nature of the proposed League. It made its appeal to the American people as a solemn compact for universal peace. It has been shown by analysis to contain the seeds of war.

THE COVENANT AS A DOCUMENT

Regarded merely as a document, it foreshadows a regenerated world; but its real significance is not to be found in the language of its text, but in the realities that lie behind them—the circumstances, traditions, motives, antagonisms, and policies of the European Powers. I do not mean to arraign or condemn the statesmen of Europe. They are the creatures of their environment, and of racial and economic facts which they have not produced and cannot change. No one can rightly understand the liabilities of this League who does not see behind the document itself—who does not intimately understand the national policies of Europe and Europe's idea of eminent domain over Asia, and Africa, and the Oceanic World. To imagine, as Mr. Wilson does—or did, before he discovered Europe—that the war has produced a fine sense of unity, of mutual sympathy, and of understanding between the Powers, is an error that would wreck any business enterprise based upon that supposition.

A good lawyer's opinion of the Covenant of the League of Nations does not warrant a conclusive judgment in its favor. Your lawyer will tell you that your contract for the purchase of a factory of explosives is a perfect document, but he cannot assure you that it will not blow up while you are in the act of signing. Yet, I think he would be a poor lawyer who could not smell powder in Article X, which pledges the signatories to "preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League."

All the obligations of the Covenant are undertaken by those who accept them. They arise automatically, whenever circumstances call them into operation. The council of the League itself cannot set them aside, when they have once been accepted. If we accept them, we become parts of a mechanism in which we are only a single cog. Herein, in the automatic character of this Covenant, lies its quality of super-government. It delegates to the operations of chance, powers which it cannot honorably recall.

It is said that all decisions require unanimity, and the vote of the United States can, therefore, control them. So can any other member of the Council; but who will take the responsibility of disregarding a solemn treaty obligation? How long is the League likely to last, after that?

It is a contest for supremacy that is involved in this issue. Which is to be supreme, the Covenant with its obligations, or the Constitution with its specifically delegated powers, which do not include a right of further delegation?

The large question is, Shall we subordinate the Constitution to the Covenant, or shall we state frankly to all the world that we will never, in the least degree, compromise the Constitution of the United States?

THE WORK OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

The Senate has tried to save the Constitution, and still accept the Treaty of Versailles, by means of certain "reservations." The President would have none of them. They provided, he declared, not for ratification, but for "nullification of the treaty."

This declaration by the President is the strongest affirmation of the supremacy of the Covenant over the Constitution that has yet been made. You have only to read the so-called "Lodge Reservations," and see by what the President refuses to accept what he thinks the obligations of the Covenant really are.

The President will not allow it to be said in the act of ratification, that the United States shall be the sole judge, in case of withdrawal, whether its obligations under Article I of the Covenant have been fulfilled; he will not allow it to be said, that the United States assumes no obligations under Article X, *unless* in a particular case the Congress shall provide for the employment of American forces; he will not allow it to be said, that the United States reserves the right to decide what questions are of a domestic character; he will not allow it to be said, that the United States will not submit to arbitration or inquiry questions depending upon or relating to the Monroe Doctrine; he will not allow it to be said, that the United States withholds its assent to the provisions regarding Shantung; he will not allow it to be said, that the United States reserves the right to increase its armament without the consent of the Council whenever the United States is threatened with invasion or engaged in war; he will not allow it to be said, that the United States assumes no obligation to be bound by a decision in which any member of the League and its dominions, or parts of empire, have cast more than one vote.

Why all these and other preemptory inhibitions of the Senate's prerogative to determine freely the terms to which it will give its advice and consent? It is be-

cause these reservations, the President says, nullify his treaty, and it must be "this treaty or no treaty."

As no one but the President of the United States can finally conclude a treaty of peace, what is this but an open threat to keep the country in a technical state of war until the Senate will yield to his demand? And the Democratic Platform pledges the Party and its candidates to sustain this position!

That Platform insists that the Treaty of Versailles, with Article X,—“the heart of the Covenant,” as the President terms it,—shall be immediately ratified, “without reservations which would impair its essential integrity.” There is to be no modification. There is to be no refusal to accept any obligation of the treaty.

MYSTIFYING THE MIND OF THE VOTER

After the President's dismissal of the “mild reservationists,” along with the other reservationists, on the ground that “mild nullification” is as offensive to him as any other, it seems like a concession, to read in the Democratic Platform a proposal of “reservations making clearer and more specific the obligations of the United States to the League.” But will any intelligent person permit himself to be deceived by this effort to mystify the mind of the voter, and make him believe he is voting for real reservations when he is not?

It has been intimated that, no matter what the platform may say, this is a matter on which the candidate personally is to act. Is a candidate, named in good faith by a great party to execute its trust, to be permitted to negotiate with the electorate for his election?

If that is to be allowed, what is the use of a party platform?

That is Wilsonism pure and simple. In his first annual message to Congress, of December 2, 1913, the President said of political conventions: “I suggest that these conventions should consist not of delegates chosen for this single purpose, but of the nominees for Congress, the nominees for vacant seats in the Senate of the United States, the Senators whose terms have not yet closed, the national committees, and the candidates for the Presidency themselves, in order that platforms may be framed by those responsible to the people for carrying them into effect.”

Government by officialdom! That is the Wilsonian idea. But even President Wilson did not suggest that each candidate should make his own platform. The President was to be there to superintend the job. Even he could not tolerate a school of demagogues, in which every aspirant for public office should bid against every other.

Whatever may have been the original intention of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, it was settled in the “world conference” held in the White House, on Sunday, July 18th. He has formally accepted the Wilson heritage in its totality. “He and I,” says the President, “were absolutely at one with regard to the great issue of the League of Nations,” and the candidate re-echoes the agreement by saying, “What he promised, I shall, if elected, endeavor with all my strength to give.”

We do not yet know, and the candidate himself may not know, all the pledges the President has made, and therefore what America would have to give; but he does

not hesitate to accept President Wilson as the dictator of our foreign obligations throughout the candidate's term of office.

What then, in this contest, does the Republican Party stand for? It stands for the policy of Washington, in avoiding the vicissitudes of European politics; for the Doctrine of Monroe, the meaning of which, it has been said, "the League is there to settle"; for the contention of McKinley and Roosevelt that true internationalism is based on law and justice, and not on force; all of which the Democratic Party now throws to the winds.

Here then at last the capital issue between the parties is clearly joined: it is American Nationalism against the Political Internationalism of Wilson, that would make our Nation, in the political sense of the word, a constituent part of a new corporate entity, a syndicate of nations, having for its aim the political control of the rest of the world.

THE POLITICAL INTERNATIONALISM OF WILSON

I call this the "Political Internationalism of Wilson," because, while the Republican Party will never accept, without modification, the Covenant of the League of Nations as it was written at Paris, it is pledged to an international association founded on the principles of justice and definite precepts of law, and not on military force.

Reading the Covenant of the League without a knowledge of history, one might infer that an association for the maintenance of peace had just been thought of for the first time. There have been many such ef-

forts for peace, and every military and political effort has failed. But there existed in 1914 the foundation of a structure in the interest of peace of far greater promise of usefulness to mankind, which was passed by in silence at Paris. The aim of that previous effort was, not to exercise political control over the nations by a military alliance of some against others; but to bring all, chastened by the world's bitter experience of war, to a common understanding, to the acceptance of a common rule of right, and to the judgment of a tribunal of reasoned justice.

The next step forward would have been an agreement to defend the law that had been accepted by virtually all nations. Against the violation of the law, which was our own law, in 1914 our Government offered no sign of protest. I shall not venture to say that a united protest of civilized nations at that time would have prevented the violation of it; I believe it would; but I feel justified in asserting that, when the aggressor was at last, with our aid, beaten to helplessness, a vigorous vindication of the law, in the name of the law, instead of an impossible pledge to preserve boundaries that have never yet been settled on any basis of national preference or reasoned principle, would have been infinitely more useful to the future peace of the world.

The attempt to unite with a punitive military peace a permanent territorial reconstruction of Europe, Asia, and Africa, on a basis of conquest veiled by the thin pretense of mandatories,—however just to the culprit nation the punishment may be, if indeed it can now be made effectual,—was an unnatural and untimely combination, urged on the Allied Powers against their will, by the President of the United States.

Had military obligations, beyond our just debt of honor to our associates in the war, been eliminated from the treaty, the United States would have accepted it and been at peace, more than a year ago; but, on the ground that this would nullify Article X, his chief personal contribution to the Covenant, the President has pledged his party that there shall be no peace until this adventurous and incalculable obligation has been accepted.

THE REAL POWER NOT THE LEAGUE

The artificiality of President Wilson's political League is revealed by the fact, that although it is in the eighth month of its actual existence as a League, it has done absolutely nothing, has solved no problem, has protected no boundary, and has stopped no one of numerous wars. The real control of Europe is vested, not in the League, but in the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers, a separate organ of action. It alone has armies at its command. Its voice alone is heard in Europe.

Whatever else happens, it is probable that this Supreme Council of the Allies will continue to operate in its own way, as it has a perfect right to do, outside and alongside the League; and if the League should attempt in any respect to change its decisions, it would find that it is subject to that Council's control.

President Wilson has perceived the existence of a problem, but he has failed to find its solution in a pledge of war to protect the boundaries of surviving empires which have already absorbed, or hold in their power, the debris of those which are now extinct. The only hope of the League's utility for peace is in a change of its center of gravity from a military to a judicial organiza-

tion. When it creates a tribunal before which a nation that is wronged may, without resort to war, present its plea for justice, and receive just judgment, the League, if it still bears that name will for the first time enjoy a real influence in the world.

REAL INTERNATIONALISM

That day is near at hand. That tribunal is now in the process of formation at The Hague. An eminent jurist and statesman, who has nobly served this Nation, is now present there, not as a political representative of his own Government, but by special invitation of the Council of the League itself, which he was one of the first to criticise as impossible. More than a year ago he said:

"I am clear that, if the Covenant has to be considered with the peace terms included, the Senate ought to include in its resolution of consent to the ratification an expression of such reservations and understandings as will cure so far as possible the defects which I have pointed out. You will probably be unable to do anything now about the system of arbitration and the development of International Law. You can, however, put into the resolution of consent a reservation refusing to agree to Article X."

Here is a positive refusal to agree to Article X, "the heart of the Covenant." That, in June, 1919, was the advice of the Honorable Elihu Root, who is now, in the name of jurisprudence, sitting with the world's great jurists at The Hague, for the purpose of substituting in our relations with Europe judicial action for political expediency and military force.

Is force then not necessary? Certainly at times it must be employed for defense, but let it be used in the first instance to defend the law, and not for political purposes.

It is as true today as when Washington pronounced the words: "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics."

ALL ISSUES DEPENDENT ON THIS

There are many other matters, both State and National, that should receive your consideration, and they will no doubt have your careful attention. I have dwelt upon this one great national issue, because decision regarding it cannot be long postponed, and because it is fundamental to all others. If we suffer our Constitution to be subordinated to any foreign influence, if we merge our nationality in a vast political scheme of internationalism, if we engage to guarantee the territorial and political pretensions of all members of this League,—the residue of Siam, the unstable beginnings of Hedjaz, the independence of Persia, menaced by a Bolshevik Russia,—if we prepare an army and a navy to do these things, how shall we meet our obligations to the social progress of our own people? Every item in our Platform halts upon the decision of this question.

OUR NATIONAL CANDIDATES

Happily, our national candidates have spoken with no uncertain sound. They did not need to wait for a platform to be constructed for them. Senator Harding had already bravely, clearly, and faithfully thrown his splendid personality into the contest in the Senate for a politically free America bound to other nations only by the rules of right, the defense of law and order under the Constitution, and a co-ordinated administration of government. Experienced in affairs, fond of counsel, deliberate in judgment, eloquent in expression, and faithful in performance, Warren G. Harding will make a noble President.

Governor Calvin Coolidge has shown in the fires of action the metal of which he is made. These candidates need no eulogy and no interpretation. It is for us to end this one-man régime, and see to it that we do not get another. In that one overmastering purpose let us all unite, and prepare for next November a triumphant victory for the principles that have created and will preserve America.

MS. A. 22439

**END OF
TITLE**